

(1)
(03)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M. C. C. NO. 15 OF 2004 Single Bench

(Arising out of dismissal in pursuance to order dated 14/11/03 passed in Civil Revision No. 305/03)

1) Nandkishore,
Son of Taransingh
Aged about 51 years,

2) Motiram,
Son of Rambharos Sahu,
Aged about 41 years,

3) Pancham,
Son of Budhau,
Aged about 65 years,

4) Rajkumar,
Son of Bhatpariya,
Aged about 18 years,

5) Ramavatar,
Son of Miththu,
Aged about 29 years,

6) Madho,
Son of Ganesh Sahu,
Aged about 40 years,

7) Siddharam,
Son of Ganesh Sahu,
Aged about 35 years,

{All Residents of Vilage – Tura,
Semariya, Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

: **APPLICANTS PETITIONERS**

P. R. No. 103/04 dated 8.1.04
Presented by Shri Pankaj Jaiswal
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

RECEIVED COPY
8.1.04

VERSUS

Gheevchand,
Son of Bhuvan Satnami,
Aged about 52 years,
Occupation – agriculture,
Resident of Tura, Semariya,
Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

: **NON APPLICANTS/ RESPONDENTS**

02

04

2) Malikram,
Son of Padum Satnami,
Aged about 40 years,
Occupation – Agriculture,
Resident of Tura, Semariya,
Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. Durg (C.G.)

3) State of Chhattisgarh through
The Collector Durg, Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

4) Karanj, Son of Raruha Satnami,
Aged about 75 years,

5) Narayan, Son of Karanj Satnami,
Aged about 54 years,

6) Brijlal, Son of Karanj Satnami,
Aged about 50 years,

7) Dharamdas, Son of Karanj Satnami,
Aged about 45 years,

8) Malik, Son of Karanj Satnami,
Aged about 42 years,

9) Dhaniram, Son of Karanj Satnami,
Aged about 35 years,

{Non applicants No. 4 to 9 are Agriculturist,
& Resident of Village – Risa-amali,
Post & Tahsil – Navagarh, Distt – Durg (C.G.)

10) Smt. Ashwani Bai,
W/o Namaklal Bhaskar,
Aged about 38 years,
Resident of Village – Tarvarpur,
Post- Karesara, Tahsil – Mungeli,
Distt. – Bilaspur (C.G.)

11) Peeladas, Son of Jhumuk Satnami,
Aged about 42 years, Agriculturist,
Resident of Village Tura, Semariya,
Tahsil – Navagarh, Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

12) Kunjram, Son of Thanvar Satnami,
Aged about 75 years,

(3)
05

13) Prem, Son of Kunjram,
Aged about 50 years,

14) Dhanush, Son of Kunjram,
Aged about 45 years,

15) Chandrika, Son of Kunjram Satnami,
Aged about 35 years,

{Non applicants No. 12 to 15 are agriculturist
& Resident of Village Dand, Tahsil – Mungeli,
Distt – Bilaspur (C.G.)

16) Janaklal, Son of Lakhani Satnami,
Aged about 51 years,

17) Gopal, Son of Dakhani Satnami,
Aged about 25 years,

{Non applicants No. 16 & 17 are Resident of
Village Tura, Semariya, Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

18) Amrit Bai, Widow of Jugnu Satnami,
Aged about 65 years, Resident of
Village Tura, Semariya, Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

19) Smt. Gulab Bai, W/o Gheevchand Satnami,
Aged about 48 years, Occupation – agriculture,
Resident of Village Manpur, Tahsil – Navagarh,
Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

20) Rajkumari, D/o Malikram,
Aged about 18 years,
Resident of Village – Tura, Semariya,
Tahsil – Navagarh, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

21) Kunwariya, D/o Malikram,
Aged about 18 years,
Resident of Village – Tura, Semariya,
Tahsil – Navagarh, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

22) Pyari Bai, D/o Malikram,
Aged about 12 years,

23) Uttara Bai, D/o Malikram,
Aged about 9 years,

(4)
06

{Non applicants No. 22 & 23 are Minor,
through the Natural Guardian, mother
Smt. Rajo Bai, W/o Malikram Gadariya,
Resident of Village – Rampur,
Tahsil – Bemetara, Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक M.C.C. No. 15/2004 सन् 200

(20)

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	19.08.2004 Shri R.S. Jaiswal, counsel for the applicants. Heard. Counsel for the applicants submits that when the matter, C.R. No. 305/2003, was taken up for hearing on 14.11.2003 it was directed that P.F. be paid within seven days and failing which the revision petition shall stand dismissed without further reference to the Bench. The petitioners have not complied the aforesaid order passed by this Court in C.R. No. 305/2003. Accordingly, in view of the order passed by this Court the aforesaid revision petition has been dismissed. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and material on record, the application is allowed. The civil revision is restored to its original number i.e. C.R. No. 305/2003 subject to objection taken by other side, leaving open the question of maintainability of this revision. **Sd/-** **Fakhruddin** **Judge**	

Vatti

[पीछे देखिये